REMARKS

Claims 1-44 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-44 are rejected. Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance, which prompt and favorable action is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. 103 Rejection

Claims 1-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being allegedly unpatentable over Hall et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,032,051) ("Hall") in view of Lopponen et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0150091) ("Lopponen"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Applicants believe that neither Hall nor Lopponen, separately or in combination, disclose, teach or suggest the features of "registering at the group communication server that no response was received from the target ... receiving information by the originator from the GCS containing information about the target in response to the alert and updating information in the originator about the target, based on the received information."

Applicants' independent claims are generally directed for "detecting or announcing presence and/or location information in a wireless communication network" (Abstract) wherein the feature of "registering at the group communication server that no response was received from the target; receiving information by the originator from the GCS containing information about the target in response to the alert." These features are not taught or suggested by the cited art. As discussed below, neither Hall nor Loppenen, singularly or in combination, disclose or suggest "registering at the group communication server that no response was received from the target; receiving information by the originator from the GCS containing information about the target in response to the alert."

2

Hall discloses wireless mobile communications devices which automatically transmit, therebetween, information regarding the status of the devices. Abstract. Although Hall does disclose the use of a Home location register (HLR) database to maintain mobile unit group membership information and group member status information, Col. 4 lines 57-66, it does not disclose, teach or suggest "registering at the group communication server that no response was received from the target; receiving information by the originator from the GCS containing information about the target in response to the alert." Hall simply teaches the ability of a member of a group to monitor other members of a group through the use of a HLR. This can be seen in the disclosure of Hall which states that "FIG. 13 illustrates phone A sending a 'status update' message to HLR. The status update message includes the status of phone A and the identification of phone A. Example FIG. 14 is similar to FIG. 13 in that phone A sends a 'status update' message to HLR including the status of phone A and the phone A identification information. However, FIG. 14 also illustrates that HLR automatically forwards this 'status update' message to other phones in the group such as phone B and phone C." Col. 5, lines 9-17. Thus, this shows Hall teaching the monitoring of group members through an HLR, but provides no teaching or suggestion of "registering at the group communication server that no response was received from the target; receiving information by the originator from the GCS containing information about the target in response to the alert."

Applicant agrees with the Examiner in that "Hall does not teach sending an alert from an originator to a to a group communication server (GCS), the alert including information about the originator and requesting information about the target, transmitting an alert from the GCS to the target; registering at the GCS that no response was received receiving information by the originator from the GCS containing information about the target in response to the alert." Page

3

4, Office Action dated July 20, 2007. However, the Examiner alleges that Lopponen teaches this particular deficiency of Hall.

Lopponen discloses a packet mode (e.g. IP) group communication service layer is provided on top of a standard mainstream cellular radio network. The bridge and the CPS run group service applications which communicate with group service application(s) in a mobile station MS over the IP connections provided by the radio network. Abstract. Lopponen also discloses group management with a group management application. Fig. 6. However Lopponen simply does not disclose, teach or suggest the features of "registering at the group communication server that no response was received from the target; receiving information by the originator from the GCS containing information about the target in response to the alert."

In fact, Lopponen simply teaches managing a group of users through the use of notifications and registrations for future group communications. This can be seen in the disclosure of Lopponen, which discloses sending notifications to group members "the user wants notification to be sent to these five persons," Para. [0141], "The notification of a new group is, for example, a special form of SMS message (e.g. ringtones, logos). The group management client application in the MS may react to this message." Para. [0142], Fig. 6. Figure 6 clearly shows that the group management client application is in the MS, as worded. Therefore the targeted user must have received this notification, and thereafter allowing the targeted user choices for action: "2) giving the MS user a choice of joining immediately (starting an active session; normal or sticky) or bookmarking for later use, or rejecting (a reject message will be sent to the group creation/management application GMA which may display it to the managing user)." Para. [0142] In other words, the targeted user must be available at that time to determine whether to accept, reject or bookmark the request to join the group. There is nothing to disclose,

4

teach or suggest that elements of "registering at the group communication server that no response was received from the target; receiving information by the originator from the GCS containing information about the target in response to the alert" as Lopponen simply does not discuss the situation when a targeted user is not available.

The office action indicates that Para. [0159] implies the use of sticky sessions when the targeted user has powered off as a form of the feature of "registering at the group communication server that no response was received from the target." As stated above, active sticky sessions, as nominally defined in Para. [0142], indicate that the targeted user must have been available at some time to provide the choice of joining immediately in a sticky session. However, Applicants' feature of "registering at the group communication server that no response was received from the target" clearly indicates that a response to the alert is sent to the initiator even when one of the targets is unavailable and not able to respond to the alert. Para. [0030 – 0034]. Para. [0159] clearly stands for the proposition that the targeted user can rejoin an active session through the use of having chosen an active sticky session earlier when re-powering on the handset. There is simply nothing in this paragraph, or any other paragraph in Loppenen, that discloses that the group management application registers that the targeted user who has chosen an active sticky session **has not responded to** the alert. Therefore, Loppenen does not remedy the deficiencies of Hall, and neither Loppenen, nor Hall, in combination or individually, disclose all the features of the claims, namely "registering at the group communication server that no response was received from the target, receiving information by the originator from the GCS containing information about the target in response to the alert and updating information in the originator about the target, based on the received information."

5

each and every element of the claims.simply does not disclose or suggest the feature where a status is not received from the target. The rejection alleges that Lopponen teaches the elements of the claims not taught by Hall. However, applicants submit that Loppenen does not remedy the deficiency of Hall and also does not disclose or suggest the feature where a status is not received from the target. Therefore, neither Hall nor Loppenen,

Dependent Claims

Claims 2-6, 8-12, 14-18, 20-24, 26-29, 31-34, 36-39 and 41-44 depend directly or ultimately from, and include all the subject matter of, claims 1, 7, 13, 19, 25, 30, 35 and 40, and should be allowed for at least the same reasons presented above regarding the independent claims as well as the additionally recited features found in the claims. Because independent claims 1, 7, 13, 19, 25, 30, 35 and 40 are believed to be allowable, Applicant has not argued or otherwise relied on independent patentability of dependent claims, but reserves the right to do so in this or any subsequent proceeding..

6

CONCLUSION

In light of the amendments contained herein, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated : October 19, 2007   By: /Raphael Freiwirth/

Raphael Freiwirth
Reg. No. 52,918
(858) 651-0777

QUALCOMM Incorporated
Attn: Patent Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121-1714
Telephone: (858) 658-5787
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502